

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 23, 2007, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1-10, 13-22, 25-34, 37 and 40 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25-28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37 and 40 stand rejected. Claims 5, 8, 17, 20, 29, and 32 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, and claims 5, 8, 17, 20, 29, and 32. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as presented herein.

Claim Rejections**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,711,413 to Heidari in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,815 to Collins et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,904 to Wang

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25-28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heidari (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,413) in view of Collins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,815). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

Applicant cancels claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25-28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37 and 40.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe the claims to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 19, 2007

By: /Roberta A. Young/
Roberta A. Young, Reg. No. 53,818
(858) 658-2447

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5803
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502